

Remarks

In response to the one-month Office action of August 16, 2005, applicant submits the following remarks.

In the non-final Office action of March 23, 2005, claims 1-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner asserts that “[t]aken as a whole the claims recite an undue multiplicity of claims by virtue of the unreasonable number of claims presented would tend to obfuscate, confuse, and becloud the claimed invention.” See Office action of March 23, 2005 at page 2, lines 11-12. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the rejection. Applicant notes that the rejected claims 1-75 include independent claims 1, 21 and 52 with dependent claims 2-20, 22-51 and 53-75, respectively, representing a number of claimed features. Applicant asserts that each of claims 1-75 articulates clear boundaries in satisfaction of the requirement under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph for definiteness. For at least these reasons, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-75.

In the one-month Office action of August 16, 2005, the Examiner indicates “that in his judgment that twenty-five (25) claims are sufficient to properly define applicants’ invention, applicants are required to select certain claims, not to exceed twenty-five for examination on the merits.” See Office action of August 16, 2005 at page 2, lines 13-15 (citing M.P.E.P. 2173.05(n)). To comply with M.P.E.P. 2173.05(n) in the event that the Examiner does not withdraw the rejection of claims 1-75, applicant elects claims 1-21 and 52-55 for the purpose of examination. As such, applicant has elected twenty-five claims, the number specified by the examiner.

Accordingly, applicant submits that this reply is fully responsive to the non-final Office action of March 23, 2005.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the

Applicant : Hiroshi Kobata et al.
Serial No. : 09/904,563
Filed : July 16, 2001
Page : 3 of 3

Attorney's Docket No.: 11365-043002

amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

No fee is believed due. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 16, 2005

Barbara A Benoit

Barbara A. Benoit

Reg. No. 54,777

Customer No.: 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40273179.doc